REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, and 17 have been amended, without prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview conducted via teleconference on April 15, 2009.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC §102(b) and 35 USC §103(a)

In the Action, claims 1-7, 11-14, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Fukutoku (US 2001-0004253), claims 8-9 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Fukutoku in view of Clark (US 3,925,777), and claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Fukutoku in view of Baron (US 3,740,743).

In response, Applicant asserts that these references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of the present claims.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites the following limitations (***emphasis added***):

> ***wherein the signal controller changes an inversion type when the number of a block pattern is larger than a predetermined value, the block pattern is formed by first and second dot blocks located in adjacent row and the same columns, the first and second dot blocks are formed by a gray difference between a pair of adjacent odd and even pixels in each block***, each dot block includes at least two successive pairs of adjacent two pixels included in at least one color pixel among the first to third color pixels, and ***a magnitude of gray difference between two pixels in each pair is equal to or larger than a critical value***.

In pg. 2, the Action purports that Fukutoku discloses these limitations. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Fig. 12, Fukutoku discloses a flicker detection process based on two adjacent pixels having a gradation difference value greater than a critical value. For example, in

par. 14, Fukutoku discloses, "a flicker-judging section (12) that detects the difference in gradation between the image data (RGB) supplied to picture elements of the same color of two pixels adjacent in a horizontal direction."

In another example, referring to par. 15, Fukutoku explicitly discloses, "flicker-judging section in which the difference in gradation between the image data of two pixels adjacent in a horizontal direction is detected by each picture element of the same color. When the difference in gradation between the image data of picture elements of the same color of two pixels adjacent in the horizontal direction is large, the size relationship between the image data of the two pixels is examined, and when the same size relationship repeats in between the pixels in the horizontal direction, it is concluded that there is a fear of occurrence of a flicker."

In still another example, referring to par. 91 and Fig. 12, Fukutoku explicitly discloses, "the gradation difference judging section 41 compares the image data for these two adjacent pixels with each other for respective colors and detects gradation differences (step S12a)."

Accordingly, Fukutoku is explicitly directed to only two adjacent pixels, wherein the flicker detection process as taught by Fukutoku is based on only two adjacent pixels having a gradation difference value greater than a critical value.

In contrast to Fukutoku, present claim 1, as amended, recites, "wherein the signal controller changes an inversion type when the number of a block pattern is larger than a predetermined value, the block pattern is formed by first and second dot blocks located in adjacent row and the same columns, the first and second dot blocks are formed by a gray difference between a pair of adjacent odd and even pixels in each block, each dot block includes at least two successive pairs of adjacent two pixels included in at least one color pixel among the first to third color pixels, and a magnitude of gray difference between two pixels in each pair is equal to or larger than a critical value," which is different than the teaching of Fukutoku. Support for these limitations may be found throughout Applicant's specification, e.g., pg. 5, line 4 to pg. 10, line 25.

Referring to Fig. 4 of the present specification, the disclosed method of changing an inversion type is adapted to calculate the number of adjacent pixels having the gray

difference larger than the critical value Pth in a single block (S403-S406). Next, when the number of adjacent pixels (e.g., the positive dot pixel value Bp or the negative dot pixel value Bn) reaches the first predetermined number (i.e., N/2; N is the number of pixels in a single block), the block is determined to be a positive dot block or a negative dot block (S411, S421, S431). These calculating and determining processes are repeated for every block in a single frame. S412 and S422 are selective processes. When the number of the positive or negative dot blocks is larger than the second predetermined number (i.e., 60 % of the total number of the blocks), it is determined that the frame has a flicker pattern (S443). Fukutoku fails to disclose or even suggest this teaching.

Moreover, the ancillary Clark and Baron references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Fukutoku. E.g., Clark is merely relied for purportedly disclosing a counter that counts clock signals, and Baron is merely relied for purportedly disclosing counting rows by utilizing synchronization signals as input into counters.

Therefore, since the cited Fukutoku reference fails to disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of present claim 1, and the ancillary Clark and Baron references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Fukutoku, present independent claim 1, as amended, and dependent claims 2-10 are considered to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectively requested.

Moreover, independent claim 11 has been amended in a similar manner as with present claim 1 and is, therefore, in view of the reasons discussed above in reference to present claim 1, considered to be in condition for allowance along with dependent claims 12-20, and such allowance is respectively requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and a timely Notice of Allowance is solicited.

If there are any questions regarding any aspect of the application, please call the undersigned at (949) 752-7040.

Certificate of Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's electronic filing system on the date below.

Electronically Filed by:

Annie McNally Dated: May 20, 2009

Annie McNally

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Hopkins
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,034